

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been amended. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20, 22 – 32 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20 and 22 – 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Deleeuw, U.S. Patent No. 5,828,900 (“Deleeuw”) in view of Srivastava (U.S. Publ. 2004/0117803). Applicants respectfully traverse the pending rejection.

Independent claim 1 requires “receiving from the application a specific request associated with said sentinel value [indicating a pending text event] to disclose said code, wherein said request is generated by the application incident to the application recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application.” Similar claim language is also found in independent claims 13, 25 and 30. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Deleeuw nor Srivastava teaches or suggests this aspect of the independent claims.

To teach the claim limitation-at-issue, the Office Action relies on Srivastava, explaining “with the use of Srivastava’s exception handling the application would send a specific request associated with a sentinel value so that it know that the data type can be handled by the application as part of the defined exception.” Office Action, p. 3. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action’s characterization of Srivastava and respectfully submit that Srivastava is silent as to the claimed request.

Srivastava relies on an **external** exception handler that prevents an exception from being handled by the application itself. This point is best illustrated by Srivastava’s Figure 2. As Figure 2 illustrates, when an exception is raised during execution of an application,

Srivastava's system invokes an external exception handler. In fact, **Srivastava is crystal clear that the application is not permitted to handle the exemption**. See Srivastava, Abstract ("The methodology described in this invention decouples the exception handling logic from the application thereby can be used to alter the behavior of the program/module/application as well as to define new types of exceptions at runtime. The decoupling of the exception handler logic eliminates the language dependence of the application"); and para. 20 ("The decoupling of exception handling logic from the program code is described which is very useful in applications that are made up of different components, which may be reused in many applications. With exception handling logic decoupled from the program, the application can extend the exceptions thrown by the components to suit its needs."). In short, Srivastava not only fails to disclose exemption handling by an application, but it expressly teaches away from allowing the exemption from being treated by the application. See *id.*

In contrast, the claims require "receiving from the application a specific request associated with said sentinel value [indicating a pending text event] to disclose said code, wherein said request is generated by the application incident to the application recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application." This claim language makes clear that the request from the application is ***specifically*** associated with a **sentinel value that indicates a pending text event**. Moreover, this request is generated by the application incident to the application "recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event." By relying on an external exception handler, nowhere does Srivastava teach or suggest "receiving from the application a specific request associated with said sentinel value [indicating a pending text event] to disclose said code, wherein said request is generated by the application incident to the application recognizing that

said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application,” as required by the claims. Thus, neither Srivastava nor Deleeuw teaches or suggests each and every aspect of the independent claims, and Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

Further, Srivastava represents non-analogous art which may not be properly combined with Deleeuw to yield the claimed invention. *See* MPEP § 2141.01. Srivastava expressly defines an exemption as “an anomalous event that occurs during the runtime of a program and disrupts the normal flow of instructions.” Srivastava, para. 2. It, however, is the **very point** of the claimed sentinel values to **avoid** any such anomalous events that disrupt the flow of the application. Put simply, the claimed processing of sentinel values in no way relates to the handling of exemptions. As such, Srivastava’s exemption handling addresses a field different from that of Applicants endeavor and logically would **not** have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering the claimed invention as a whole. *See* MPEP § 2141.01. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

Finally, for the reasons stated above, Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2 - 6 and 8 - 12, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 14 – 20 and 22 - 24, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 26 - 29, which depend from claim 25, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 25. Applicants further submit that

dependent claims 31 and 32, which depend from claim 30, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20, 22 – 32 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547